

Appln. No. 09/887,080  
Amdt. dated March 31, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 4, 2005

REMARKS

This application contains claims 1-42. Claims 1, 18 and 25 are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks Examiners Pesin and Kincaid for the courtesy of a telephone interview granted to Applicant's representative, Daniel Kligler (Reg. No. 41,120) on January 26, 2005. In the interview, it was agreed that amending the independent claims in this application to recite explicitly a "human operator" would overcome the prior art of record. The Examiner also explained that in rejecting the independent claims in the present Official Action, he had interpreted the term "verification" to include verifying the importance of the data, since the independent claims do not recite explicitly verification of correctness of the data.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 18, 22, 25, 30, 31 and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Lorie (U.S. Patent 5,933,531) in view of Fleming (U.S. Patent 6,473,752). Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 18 and 25, as agreed in the above-mentioned interview, to clarify the distinction of the present invention over the cited art.

Lorie describes a method for verification and correction of automatic optical character recognition (OCR)

Appln. No. 09/887,080  
Amdt. dated March 31, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 4, 2005

results. After OCR on a batch of documents, an automatic context analyzer processes the fields that are good enough (in terms of the confidence of the OCR results) to expect resolution by the context analyzer. This step aims to accept as many fields as possible without any operator intervention (col. 3, lines 24-30, and col. 5, lines 62-67). For some other fields, operator input is used to certify or correct the OCR results for a certain percentage of the characters, so that automatic context analysis may accept some of the remaining fields (col. 3, lines 31-34). Fields that are still not resolved can be shown to the operator for acceptance, correction or entry (col. 3, lines 37-40).

Fleming describes a system for locating computer documents or data of interest to a user, by detecting the selection of computer documents by the user and monitoring the user's interaction with the documents. One of the factors used to measure the importance of a term or topic to the user is the total time of access by the user to a document containing the term or topic (col. 7, lines 15-17).

Claims 1, 18 and 25 in the present patent application, as amended, respectively recite a method, apparatus and computer software product for evaluating verification of data by a human operator. The method includes measuring a time duration over which the operator interacts

Appln. No. 09/887,086  
Amdt. dated March 31, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 4, 2005

with a display in verifying data presented on the display, and evaluating the verification of the data by the operator responsive to the time duration. Lorie, on the other hand, relates to evaluation of results obtained by a computerized process (automatic context analysis), and not evaluating results of verification by a human operator, as recited in the amended claims. Therefore, as agreed in the interview, amended claims 1, 18 and 25 are believed to be patentable over the cited art. In view of the patentability of these independent claims, dependent claims 6, 7, 9, 22, 30, 31 and 33 are believed to be patentable, as well.

Claims 2-5, 8, 10-17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-29, 32 and 34-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Lorie in view of Fleming and further in view of one or more of Matsukawa et al. (U.S. Patent 6,470,336), deCarmo et al. (U.S. Patent 6,181,339), Strub et al. (U.S. Patent 6,563,532), Burch (U.S. Patent 6,295,387), Graves (U.S. Patent 6,454,173), Allen (U.S. Patent 4,256,953), Melville et al. (U.S. Patent 5,982,555), Radomsky et al. (U.S. Patent 6,600,899) and Graham et al. (U.S. Patent 6,281,879). In view of the patentability of amended independent claims 1, 18 and 25, from which these claims depend, claims 2-5, 8, 10-17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-29, 32 and 34-42 are believed to be patentable over the cited references.

Appln. No. 09/887,086  
Amdt. dated March 31, 2005  
Reply to Office Action of January 4, 2005

Applicant believes the amendments and remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all of the grounds of rejection raised by the Examiner. In view of these amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By



Norman J. Latker

Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197

Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

G:\BN\C\colb\Zlotnick1\PTO\Amendment-RCE.doc